wounds, toothache, pyorrhea, mouth sores, bleeding gums, abscessed teeth, inflamed tonsils, sinus trouble, ulcerated and pus cases, irritation caused by artificial teeth, tongue blisters, swollen gums, sore throat, catarrh, and disorders of the mouth and throat; that the article would be effective in treating a dead and abscessed tooth where bone tissue had partly decayed; that it would be effective for healing and hardening tender and bleeding gums; that it would be effective in stopping toothache and in preventing and relieving pyorrheal conditions; that it would be effective in healing sunburn, infections, cuts, bruises, scalds, and insect and animal bites; that it would be effective in healing power in absorbing poisonous substances of the body and in relieving soreness and inflammation; that it would correct and prevent disorders, preserve the teeth and tissues, check ailments and stop pain, and relieve pain in the gums of teething infants.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (b) (2), the tubes containing the article bore no statement of the quantity of the contents.

DISPOSITION: October 13, 1948. A plea of guilty having been entered, the court imposed a fine of $100 and costs.

2765. Misbranding of Spectro-Chrome. U. S. v. 1 Device * * *. (F. D. C. No. 17419. Sample No. 16673–H.)

LIBEL FILED: September 29, 1945, Western District of Michigan.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: By the Dinshah Spectro-Chrome Institute, from Newfield and Malaga, N. J. The device was shipped on or about August 21, 1945, and a quantity of printed and graphic matter was shipped on or about August 22, 1945.

PRODUCT: 1 *Spectro-Chrome* device at Houghton, Mich., together with a quantity of printed and graphic matter entitled "Favorscope for 1945," "Rational Food of Man," "Spectro-Chrome General Advice Chart for the Service of Mankind—Free Guidance Request," "Certificate of Benefit Studentship," "Spectro-Chrome—December 1941—Scarlet," "Spectro-Chrome Irradiation—Free Guidance," and "Spectro-Chrome Manual for Dinshah Spectro-Chrome."

The device consisted essentially of a cabinet equipped with an electric light bulb, an electric fan, a container for water, glass condenser lenses, and glass slides, each of a different color. The cabinet had an opening in the front in which the glass slides could be inserted and through which the light from the bulb would emit.

NATURE OF CHARGE: Misbranding, Section 502 (a), the label statements "Dinshah Spectro-Chrome * * * Visible Spectrum Color Projector * * * This Spectro-Chrome Projector * * * is a Benefit granted to an Affiliate of Dinshah Spectro-Chrome Institute, a * * * Health Corporation * * * * * * It is presented for self-use and self-verification" were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the device was capable of restoring, maintaining, or otherwise favorably influencing the health of the user. The device was incapable of accomplishing the results claimed, and the use of colored light would have no effect on health.

Further misbranding, Section 502 (a), the statements and references in the printed and graphic matter accompanying the device were false and misleading. These statements represented and suggested that the device when used as directed was effective for the attainment, improvement, restoration, and maintenance of health. The device was not effective for such purposes,

and when used as directed, or in any manner whatsoever, may delay appropriate treatment of serious diseases, resulting in serious or permanent injury or death to the user.

DISPOSITION: Tyyne Helena Lindrus, Houghton, Mich., filed an answer to the libel, denying that the device was misbranded. Thereafter, on April 11, 1949, upon motion by the United States attorney, an order was entered directing the claimant to post security for costs, and providing that upon the claimant's failure to post such security, the Government might apply for an order of condemnation.

On May 23, 1949, upon the failure of the claimant to comply with the order of April 11, 1949, judgment of condemnation was entered and the device was ordered destroyed.

DRUGS FOR VETERINARY USE

2766. Adulteration and misbranding of Avi-Green Drinking Water Tablets. U. S. v. 138 Bottles * * *. (F. D. C. No. 27025. Sample No. 1432-K.)

LIBEL FILED: April 25, 1949, Western District of North Carolina.

ALLEGED SHIPMENT: On or about April 10 and May 12, 1948, by the Anchor Serum Co., from South St. Joseph, Mo.

PRODUCT: 138 25-tablet bottles of *Avi-Green Drinking Water Tablets* at Charlotte, N. C.

LABEL, IN PART: "Avi-Green Drinking Water Tablets (Poultry Usage Only) Each tablet contains: 3-Nitro-4-hydroxyphenylarsonic acid, 1.40 grs.; Ammonium Sulfocarbolate, 13.80 grs.; Sodium Sulfocarbolate, 13.80 grs., combined with Benzal Green in an inert and entirely soluble base. Manufactured by Pharmaceutical Division Anchor Serum Company South Saint Joseph, Missouri."

NATURE OF CHARGE: Adulteration, Section 501 (a) (4), the article contained a coal-tar color other than one from a batch that had been certified in accordance with the regulations.

Misbranding, Section 502 (a), certain statements on the label of the article were false and misleading in that they represented and implied that the article was manufactured by the Anchor Serum Co. of South Saint Joseph, Mo., and that it was effective for disinfection of poultry drinking water and for the control of intestinal infections and intestinal parasites of poultry, whereas it was manufactured for the Anchor Serum Company by another firm and would not be effective for controlling infections and parasites generally of the intestines of poultry; Section 502 (b) (1), the label of the article failed to reveal the connection which the Anchor Serum Company had with the article; and, Section 502 (e) (2), the article was fabricated from two or more ingredients and its label failed to bear the common or usual name of the active ingredients since the ingredients of the article were declared in a manner which implied that three were active, whereas only one ingredient was active for the purposes recommended. Further misbranding, Section 502 (f) (2), the labeling of the article failed to bear such adequate warnings against unsafe dosage and methods and duration of administration in such manner and form as are necessary for the protection of users since the article contained organic arsenic and its label failed to warn against use in the drinking water of ducks, geese, and other waterfowl; and its label failed also to warn against use during the